



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

10

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/064,587	07/29/2002	Judson Sloan Marte	RD-282041	5118

6147 7590 03/02/2005

GENERAL ELECTRIC COMPANY
GLOBAL RESEARCH
PATENT DOCKET RM. BLDG. K1-4A59
NISKAYUNA, NY 12309

EXAMINER

BARRERA, RAMON M

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2832

DATE MAILED: 03/02/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/064,587

Applicant(s)

MARTE ET AL.

Examiner

Ramon M. Barrera

Art Unit

2832

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 02 December 2004.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,3-28 and 31-55 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 3-7, 13, 15, 32-36, 42, 44 and 51-55 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,8-12, 14, 16-28, 31, 37-41, 43 and 45-50 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

1. Claims 3-7, 13, 15, 32-36, 42, 44, and 51-55 remain withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b) as being drawn to a nonelected invention, there being no allowable generic or linking claim.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1, 8-12, 16-17, 20-28, 31, 37-41, 45, 46, and 48-50 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Laskaris, et al.(US6150819), cited on Applicant's IDS, in view of Nachman.

Laskaris in Fig. 10A discloses a laminated magnetic pole piece comprising a plurality of stacks with sheets of adjacent stacks oriented at an angle. The sheets are made of an alloy that comprises iron and aluminum (col. 8, lines 14-15). The sheets are .0254 mm (1 mil) thick (col 4, line 22) and bound with inherently electrically insulating adhesive (col. 4, lines 46-52).

Laskaris failed to disclose the resistivity and the percentage of Al in his Al-Fe alloy. Nachman disclosed Al-Fe sheets having up to 16% Al, with a thickness as thin as .01mm (0.00035in), and with a resistivity of 140-150 microhm-cm. (col. 3, line 43). Nachman disclosed his material was advantageous for magnetic applications because it

resulted in lower electrical losses. Since Laskaris and Nachman are both from the same field of endeavor, the purpose disclosed by Nachman would have been recognized in the pertinent art of Laskaris. It would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to employ Nachman's Al-Fe material in Laskaris for the purpose of providing reduced electrical losses.

With regards to Claims 17, 20-21, 23-27, 46, and 48-50, the claimed product appears to be the same or similar to that of Laskaris in view of Nachman. It is noted that product by process limitations are not limited to the manipulations of the recited steps, only the structure implied by the steps.

4. Claims 14, 18-19, 43 and 47 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Laskaris in view of Nachman, and further in view of Kaufman, et al..

Laskaris in view of Nachman failed to specify the electrically insulating material separating the sheets. However, in col. 4, lines 51-52, Laskaris states "the adhesive may comprise any adhesive substance known in the art as a metal to metal adhesive". Kaufman discloses the use of epoxy for the purpose of providing an insulating filler between pole piece laminations. Since Laskaris, Nachman, and Kaufman are all from the same field of endeavor, the purpose disclosed by Laskaris in view of Nachman would have been recognized in the pertinent art of Kaufman. It would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to employ an epoxy adhesive in Laskaris in view of Nachman for the purpose of providing an insulating filler. With regards to claims 18-19 and 47, the claimed product appears to be the same or similar to that of Laskaris in view of Nachman, and further in view of

Art Unit: 2832

Kaufman. It is noted that product by process limitations are not limited to the manipulations of the recited steps, only the structure implied by the steps.

5. Claims 14, 18-19, 43 and 47 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Laskaris in view of Nachman, and further in view of Nishihara, et al.

Laskaris in view of Nachman failed to specify the electrically insulating material separating the sheets. However, in col. 4, lines 51-52, Laskaris states, "the adhesive may comprise any adhesive substance known in the art as a metal to metal adhesive". Nishihara discloses the use of polycarbosilane (polyorganosilane) for the purpose of providing an adhesive between metallic materials (col.1, lines 53-55). It would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to employ a polyorganosilane adhesive in Laskaris in view of Nachman for the purpose of adhering the metallic sheets because adhesives for metallic materials was known to be reasonably pertinent to the art of Laskaris in view of Nachman. With regards to claims 18-19 and 47, the claimed product appears to be the same or similar to that of Laskaris in view of Nachman, and further in view of Kaufman. It is noted that product by process limitations are not limited to the manipulations of the recited steps, only the structure implied by the steps.

Conclusion

6. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Harris, Adams(2), and Masumoto disclosed Al-Fe alloy materials.

Art Unit: 2832

7. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).


A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ramon M. Barrera whose telephone number is (571) 272-1987. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 11 to 5PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Elvin G. Enad can be reached on (571) 272-1990. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 2832

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).


Ramon M Barrera
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 2832

rmb